

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

11th June, 1982

[redacted]
Lockheed Corporation
Burbank, California 91520

Dear [redacted]

I assume by this time you may have received the letter of 7th June from Colonel Lawson regarding #347, a copy of which has been hand-carried to me. However, I see no indication that you were copied on Colonel Lawson's letter of the same date to me, so I am enclosing a copy with this missive.

As in all such matters, compromise is inevitable and I believe that paragraph 2 (a) of Lawson's letter to me is the best we can hope for at this time as far as laying hands on installed avionics and other internal components of the airplane. I do not have unlimited faith in the prospect of shortstopping these components by means of a depot shortage list, at least not without frequent checking from outside the system, or warnings from friends in the Skunk Works or at NASA.

In the past week, I have had several conversations with [redacted] regarding AGE to be borrowed from his group at Ames. As I believe I noted to you, Jim says that the components he has that were specifically modified to accommodate the U-2 in a C-141 are surplus to his future needs. These include wing stands, an aft section cart, dust plugs and canvas covers but not a fuselage cart. Yesterday Jim told me that he had been in touch with [redacted] of your plant and that he now feels a fuselage cart can be scrounged up from assets known to [redacted]. Jim also suggested that if it made everyone happier he would arrange to lend the entire package to the Smithsonian for, say, six months, after which the gear could be turned in to Warner-Robbins AFB Depot. This would enable the Air & Space people to put the entire aircraft under roof without assembly until Building 21 at the Garber Facility is cleared and ready for the re-assembly after Labor Day. As I recall, you were going to see about landing a set of Pogos to come back on the trucks, for the post-assembly phase.

If this plan works out, I would hope that there might still be funds available from the LAC/P&W kitty to cover sending a U-2 supervisor from California to Washington to oversee reassembly when the time comes, on one of those cheapie non-stop flights showing signs of still being in effect in the fall. Also, if necessary, there might even be enough money left to pay for moving the AGE from here to Georgia and the depot if arrangements can't be made to turn it in at Andrews AFB locally.

As for Colonel Lawson's repeated assertion that a non P13B version of the J-75 engine will not fit in the U-2 airframe, I prefer to rely on your assertion that it will once the afterburner section is removed. I hope that a way can be found to obtain a runout J-75 engine, even if one has to

-2-

be snagged back from a friendly foreign air force, assuming that we still have any friends abroad!

As far as a prospective delivery date for the U-2 is concerned, my reasons for mentioning mid-July to Colonel Lawson, as opposed to a time that might mesh better with Air & Space at the Garber Facility were threefold: first, I could see little or no forward motion on the part of Air Force in getting an approval to proceed in your hands. Secondly, I got the impression from you that if nothing was seen to be happening, there might be a softening of the financial commitment at the corporate level, either in California or Connecticut. The old saw about "Use it or lose it" had an element of truth in it. Thirdly, I felt that without an impending delivery date, the business of clearing out Building 21 might slip so far downstream that no matter when a date was selected it might always be too soon.

Although the subject of rigging the aircraft in "appropriate markings" has not come up yet, except by brief mention in your 17th March letter to Colonel Lawson, I guess it should be addressed now to see what your views on it are. Personally, if we are striving for authenticity, I would like to see the aircraft arrive unmarked save for the normal cautionary decals, plus perhaps "347" on the tail. After all, when we were doing the primary mission we weren't keen on advertising either the aircraft or its components. I realize that Air Force may prefer "standard Air Force markings," including the multi-digit serial number on the tail, on the theory that advertising in the Museum won't hurt. I would like to avoid this becoming a Federal case, but it has all the ingredients, doesn't it? How do you feel about it?

We have discussed informally the question of LAC furnishing manuals with the bird. I have in mind such items as the E & M manual, J-75 installation drawings and instructions, airframe general arrangement drawings, operations manual (Dash One), as well as electrical layouts and anything else that might be useful in giving a total picture of the technology. We have here a fairly complete set of Service Bulletins that could be made available to the Museum. Anything you have in these categories on microfilm we could have duplicated here and return the film to you to reduce your costs at that end. I gather that some of the basic info on the original engineering is in storage at Rye Canyon. Perhaps we could cover this when next we talk on the phone.

I have also wondered if LAC has a "B" camera hatch for the aircraft left over. It would be useful to have, either installed or static to fit with the "B" camera itself. Another point to cover.

As you may have heard, Les Dirks is leaving 2nd July to go to Raytheon in Boston. He is being replaced by R.E. Hineman the next day. Evan Hineman was with Carl Duckett in the missiles and space side of things. John McMahon was sworn in as DDCI yesterday by Vice-President Bush, so, as Joan Baez sang: "Things they are a changin'."

I will be back in touch. Meanwhile, all the best.

Sincerely,



STAT